

# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

ROBERT MCGUIRE, #83383	) )
Plaintiff,	3:10-cv-00488-HDM-RAM
VS.	) ) ORDER
STATE OF NEVADA, et al.,	) ORDER
Defendants.	) ) /

This is a prisoner civil rights action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The court now reviews the complaint.

### I. Screening Standard

Pursuant to the Prisoner Litigation Reform Act (PLRA), federal courts must dismiss a prisoner's claims, "if the allegation of poverty is untrue," or if the action "is frivolous or malicious," "fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted," or "seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief." 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2). A claim is legally frivolous when it lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact. *Nietzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989). The court may, therefore, dismiss a claim as frivolous where it is based on an indisputably meritless legal theory or where the factual contentions are clearly baseless. *Id.* at 327. The critical inquiry is whether a

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

constitutional claim, however inartfully pleaded, has an arguable legal and factual basis. *See Jackson v. Arizona*, 885 F.2d 639, 640 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1989).

Dismissal of a complaint for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted is provided for in Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6), and the court applies the same standard under Section 1915(e)(2) when reviewing the adequacy of a complaint or amended complaint. Review under Rule 12(b)(6) is essentially a ruling on a question of law. See Chappel v. Laboratory Corp. of America, 232 F.3d 719, 723 (9th Cir. 2000). A complaint must contain more than a "formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action;" it must contain factual allegations sufficient to "raise a right to relief above the speculative level." Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 127 S. Ct. 1955, 1965 (2007). "The pleading must contain something more...than...a statement of facts that merely creates a suspicion [of] a legally cognizable right of action." Id. In reviewing a complaint under this standard, the court must accept as true the allegations of the complaint in question, Hospital Bldg. Co. v. Rex Hospital Trustees, 425 U.S. 738, 740 (1976), construe the pleading in the light most favorable to plaintiff and resolve all doubts in the plaintiff's favor. Jenkins v. McKeithen, 395 U.S. 411, 421 (1969). Allegations in a pro se complaint are held to less stringent standards than formal pleadings drafted by lawyers. See Hughes v. Rowe, 449 U.S. 5, 9 (1980); Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519, 520-21 (1972) (per curiam); see also Balistreri v. Pacifica Police Dep't, 901 F.2d 696, 699 (9th Cir. 1990). All or part of a complaint filed by a prisoner may be dismissed *sua sponte*, however, if the prisoner's claims lack an arguable basis either in law or in fact. This includes claims based on legal conclusions that are untenable (e.g. claims against defendants who are immune from suit or claims of infringement of a legal interest which clearly does not exist), as well as claims based on fanciful factual allegations (e.g. fantastic or delusional scenarios). See Neitzke, 490 U.S. at 327-28; see also McKeever v. Block, 932 F.2d 795, 798 (9th Cir. 1991).

To sustain an action under section 1983, a plaintiff must show (1) that the conduct complained of was committed by a person acting under color of state law; and (2) that the conduct deprived the plaintiff of a federal constitutional or statutory right." *Hydrick v. Hunter*, 466 F.3d 676,

689 (9th Cir. 2006).

#### II. Instant Complaint

Plaintiff, who is incarcerated at Ely State Prison ("ESP"), has sued ESP corrections officers Tom Stubbs, David Drummond, and Michael Lee. Plaintiff alleges the following: on or about August 24, 2008, defendants used excessive force against plaintiff while he was handcuffed and in leg irons. Defendants "assaulted, beat, [and] kicked" plaintiff, causing injuries, including a large swelling above his left temple that required surgery. He continues to suffer dizziness, blurred vision, damaged nerves, headaches and joint damage. Plaintiff claims violations of his Eighth and Fourteenth Amendment rights.

At the outset, the court notes that, "Where a particular amendment 'provides an explicit textual source of constitutional protection' against a particular sort of government behavior, 'that Amendment, not the more generalized notion of "substantive due process," must be the guide for analyzing [a plaintiff's] claims'." *Albright v. Oliver*, 510 U.S. 266, 273-74 (1994) (Rehnquist, C.J., for plurality) (quoting *Graham v. Connor*, 490 U.S. 386, 395 (1989)). Therefore, plaintiff's claims will be analyzed under the Eighth Amendment right to be free from cruel and unusual punishment rather any generalized notions of substantive due process under the Fourteenth Amendment, and his Fourteenth Amendment due process claim is dismissed.

The Eighth Amendment prohibits the imposition of cruel and unusual punishments and "embodies broad and idealistic concepts of dignity, civilized standards, humanity and decency." *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97, 102 (1976). "[W]henever prison officials stand accused of using excessive physical force in violation of the [Eighth Amendment], the core judicial inquiry is . . . whether force was applied in a good-faith effort to maintain or restore discipline, or maliciously and sadistically to cause harm." *Hudson v. McMillian*, 503 U.S. 1, 6-7 (1992); *see also Whitley v. Albers*, 475 U.S. 312, 320-21 (1986); *Watts v. McKinney*, 394 F.3d 710, 711 (9th Cir. 2005); *Martinez v. Stanford*, 323 F.3d 1178, 1184 (9th Cir. 2003); *Marquez v. Gutierrez*, 322 F.3d 689, 691-92 (9th Cir. 2003); *Clement v. Gomez*, 298 F.3d 898, 903 (9th Cir. 2002); *Jeffers v. Gomez*, 267 F.3d 895, 900 (9th Cir. 2001) (*per curiam*); *Schwenk v.* 

Hartford, 204 F.3d 1187, 1196 (9th Cir. 2000); Robins v. Meecham, 60 F.3d 1436, 1441 (9th Cir. 1995); 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13

## III. Conclusion

15

16 (docket #1-2).

17 18

14

PROCEED.

20

19

21 22

23 24

25

26

Berg v. Kincheloe, 794 F.2d 457, 460 (9th Cir. 1986). When determining whether the force is excessive, the court should look to the "extent of injury . . ., the need for application of force, the relationship between that need and the amount of force used, the threat 'reasonably perceived by the responsible officials,' and 'any efforts made to temper the severity of a forceful response.'" Hudson, 503 U.S. at 7 (quoting Whitley, 475 U.S. at 321); see also Martinez, 323 F.3d at 1184. Although the Supreme Court has never required a showing that an emergency situation existed, "the absence of an emergency may be probative of whether the force was indeed inflicted maliciously or sadistically." Jordan, 986 F.2d at 1528 n.7; see also Jeffers, 267 F.3d at 913 (deliberate indifference standard applies where there is no "ongoing prison security measure"); Johnson v. Lewis, 217 F.3d 726, 734 (9th Cir. 2000). Moreover, there is no need for a showing of serious injury as a result of the force, but the lack of such injury is relevant to the inquiry. See Hudson, 503 U.S. at 7-9; Martinez, 323 F.3d at 1184; Schwenk, 204 F.3d at 1196. Plaintiff states an Eighth Amendment excessive force claim against defendants.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that plaintiff's Eighth Amendment claim MAY

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court shall FILE the complaint

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that plaintiff's Fourteenth Amendment claim is DISMISSED.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that defendant(s) shall file and serve an answer or other response to the complaint within thirty (30) days following the date of the early inmate mediation. If the court declines to mediate this case, an answer or other response shall be due within thirty (30) days following the order declining mediation.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the parties SHALL DETACH, COMPLETE, AND FILE the attached Notice of Intent to Proceed with Mediation form on or before thirty (30) days from the date of entry of this order.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that henceforth, plaintiff shall serve upon defendants, or, if an appearance has been made by counsel, upon their attorney(s), a copy of every pleading, motion, or other document submitted for consideration by the court. Plaintiff shall include with the original paper submitted for filing a certificate stating the date that a true and correct copy of the document was mailed to the defendants or counsel for defendants. If counsel has entered a notice of appearance, the plaintiff shall direct service to the individual attorney named in the notice of appearance, at the address stated therein. The court may disregard any paper received by a district judge or a magistrate judge that has not been filed with the Clerk, and any paper which fails to include a certificate showing proper service.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that defendants' motion to extend time (docket #4) is **DENIED**.

DATED: November 29, 2010.

JNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

# 1 2 Name 3 Prison Number Address 4 5 6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA 8 Case No. Plaintiff, 9 NOTICE OF INTENT TO v. PROCEED WITH MEDIATION 10 11 Defendants. 12 13 This case may be referred to the District of Nevada's early inmate mediation program. The purpose of this notice is to assess the suitability of this case for mediation. Mediation is a process by 14 which the parties meet with an impartial court-appointed mediator in an effort to bring about an 15 expedient resolution that is satisfactory to all parties. Do you wish to proceed to early mediation in this case? Yes No 16 1. 17 If no, please state the reason(s) you do not wish to proceed with mediation? 18 19 20 21 3. List any and all cases, including the case number, that plaintiff has filed in federal or state court in the last five years and the nature of each case. (Attach additional pages if needed). 22 23 24 25 List any and all cases, including the case number, that are currently pending or any pending 26 grievances concerning issues or claims raised in this case. (Attach additional pages if needed).

Case 3:10-cv-00488-HDM-WGC Document 9 Filed 11/30/10 Page 6 of 7

5.	Are there suitable f suitable f	any other co for mediation for mediation	omments you n. You may: n. (Attach ad	would like to express to the court about whether this cainclude a brief statement as to why you believe this caditional pages if needed).
	-			
	This form	n shall be fi	led with the	Clerk of the Court on or before thirty (30) days from
	of this orde			
consi			nts: By signing ve of the Nev	ng this form you are certifying to the court that you vada Department of Corrections concerning participation
consi	Counsel ulted with a ation.	for defendar representati		ng this form you are certifying to the court that you vada Department of Corrections concerning participation, 20
consi	Counsel ulted with a ation.	for defendar representati		
consi	Counsel ulted with a ation.	for defendar representati		
consi	Counsel ulted with a ation.	for defendar representati		
consi	Counsel ulted with a ation.	for defendar representati		
consi	Counsel ulted with a ation.	for defendar representati		
consi	Counsel ulted with a ation.	for defendar representati		
consi	Counsel ulted with a ation.	for defendar representati		
consi	Counsel ulted with a ation.	for defendar representati		
consi	Counsel ulted with a ation.	for defendar representati		